DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 348 746 EA 024 206

AUTHOR Vojtek, RoseAnne O'Brien
TITLE Integrating Staff Development and Organization Development: An Empirical Study of Staff Developers.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; Inservice Education; *Organizational Development; *Professional Development; *Program Development; *Staff Development

ABSTRACT

Findings of a study that explored the role of staff developers in integrating staff development with organizational development are presented in this paper. Staff development (SD) is defined as professional development for individuals to improve student instruction; organizational development (OD) is defined as professional development for groups to improve school culture. The study was conducted by the University of Oregon's Center for Organizational Development in Schools during the 1990-91 year. A survey mailed to 522 members of the National Staff Development Council (NSDC) elicited 115 usable responses, a 22 percent response rate. Telephone interviews were also conducted with 36 NSDC members. Findings suggest that staff developers: (1) have ambiguous roles and job descriptions; (2) have less knowledge and practice in executing a classical OD macrodesign than they have in regard to specific OD skills; (3) perceive themselves as effective group process facilitators; (4) encourage participatory management styles; and (5) are beginning to involve support staff. A positive relationship exists between knowledge, involvement, and effective integration of staff development with organizational development. Seven charts are included. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED348746

INTEGRATING STAFF DEVELOPMENT and ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT:

An Empirical Study of Staff Developers

RoseAnne O'Brien Vojtek
University of Oregon

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. O'Brien
[Vojtek]

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

American Educational Research Association
Annual Meeting
April 20—24, 1992
San Francisco, California

EA 024 206

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTEGRATING STAFF DEVELOPMENT and ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT: An Empirical Study of Staff Developers

Educational reform has become a national concern and priority. Politicians are talking about it, legislators are mandating it, and school districts across the United States seem to be involved in restructuring in one form or another. For many of these districts, staff developers are increasingly recognized as the change agents. Indeed, current literature views staff developers as the critical link to organizational change. They are repeatedly being called to facilitate innovations which are designed to lead to effective school renewal and institutionalized school reform.

School districts across the country are exploring changes under the guise of school restructuring by engaging in activities like strategic planning, site-based management, action research, participatory decision-making, school improvement teams, and collegial support groups. After years of teachers being isolated, disconnected, and loosely-coupled, it is not surprising that conflict arises when they meet at last to diagnose, rank-order, plan, implement, evaluate and sustain organizational changes. When teachers are unable to work together, staff developers, who previously were recognized as academic leaders and instructional trainers, are being called to provide educators with the tools they need to collaborate.

Staff Developers are scrambling and in many cases blindly struggling to train district personnel in organization development skills (e.g., problem-solving, decision-making, communication, team-building), which were until

recently, absent from most professional growth programs. Throughout the current literature staff developers are challenged to:

- change educators' beliefs and behaviors to support school improvement;
- emphasize a set of open, participatory practices;
- shift the emphasis from the workshop to the work group;
- provide teachers with opportunities to develop trust and build collegial support;
- lead by example (model) and provide a blueprint (vision) while addressing major educational and social issues;
- diagnose and formulate goals into systematic action plans which are then implemented, sustained over time, self-renewing and eventually, institutionalized;
- and, evolve from the role of staff development trainer to the more encompassing role of organization development specialist.

Who are these Michelangelo's of education; these staff developers who can take the blank pages, the raw data, the scarce resources and in some instances, the lumps of clay thrown at them, and transform the organization, shift the paradigms of thinking and rebuild the educational structure? What do these "artists", "miracle workers", "catalysts of change", "sellers of programs", and "educational leaders" do in their role as staff developer? Are they beginning to integrate organization development strategies into their job descriptions? More specifically, how do staff developers perceive their own attitude, knowledge and use of organization development skills in their staff development practices? And, if staff developers are using organization development in their work, what does the change process look like when the two are integrated?

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

To answer questions like these, a recent two-part study was conducted at the University of Oregon's Center for Organization Development in Schools during the 1990-91 school year. The study was funded by a mini-grant from the University Council on Educational Administration (UCEA). The National Staff Development Council (NSDC) assisted the study by providing approximately 550 names of members, who listed staff development as their primary job responsibility, on their membership form. Those members became the target population for this study.

The first phase of the study entailed sending a five-page survey to the 522 members of NSDC, who lived in the United States (Canada was not included). The questionnaire was designed to determine how staff developers perceive their own organization development knowledge, attitudes and use of skills. Survey questionnaires were mailed in late October 1990. From the 522 NSDC members surveyed, 115 responses were collected from 35 of the 50 states (22% return rate). An additional 9 surveys were returned unopened for various reasons.

Although inservice education began well over a century ago, most professional growth was remedial in nature. It wasn't really until the 1960s that inservice education began to shift to a curricular emphasis with a national focus on math and science. Staff development as we see it today has blossomed primarily from the effective teaching research of the 1970s, which added an emphasis on instructional skills, and the introduction of computer technology during the 1980s.

Organization development was not found in education until the early 1960s. In their research review, Fullan, Miles and Taylor (1980, p. 172), reported that only about one percent of the schools in North America were

using OD in 1980. Yet, they concluded from a review of empirical research, that OD is a useful change strategy:

> a strategy which will, if its own reflexive, self-evaluative character is maintained, become increasingly well-adapted to the task of improving schools (Fullan, Miles, Taylor, 1980, p. 178).

Schmuck and Runkel (1988, p. 47) define organization development in schools as:

> a coherent, systematically planned, sustained effort at system self-study and improvement, focusing explicitly on change in norms, structures, and procedures, using behavioral science concepts. OD involves system members themselves in the active assessment, diagnosis, and transformation of their own organization.

A simple, clear distinction needed to be made between staff development and organization development. For purposes of this study, staff development (SD) is defined as professional development for individuals to improve student instruction. Organization development (OD) is defined as professional development for groups to improve school climate.

Survey questions were formulated by using Schmuck and Runkel's handbook (1988) as a guide of strategies and techniques used in OD interventions. For example, Schmuck and Runkel (1988, p. 33) described the overall sequence of an OD project as: "startup, contract building, diagnosis, macrodesigning, implementing and monitoring microdesigns, evaluating outcomes, and institutionalizing the school's capability for continuous problem solving." The specific information about staff developers' perceived knowledge, interest and use of OD strategies and techniques (e.g., diagnosis, survey-data procedures, process observation and feedback) was solicited in individual survey questions and incorporated all stages of the overall

sequence of an OD project. Several open-ended questions were asked at the end of the survey to allow staff developers to describe staff development and/or organization development activities, both during the present year (1990-91) and the next year (1991-92).

The second phase of the study entailed telephone interviews with 36 NSDC members for approximately an hour. This pool of 36 interviewees was selected from those members who, on their returned survey, stated that they were willing to be interviewed and were currently involved with staff development, organization development, and/or integrating staff development and organization development. The purpose of the follow-up interviews was to enrich the original survey responses with in-depth information about designs for school improvement in the districts of the staff developers who were interviewed. From the 115 returned surveys: 61 respondents were willing to be interviewed by telephone (53%); 40 respondents were not willing to be interviewed by telephone (35%); and 14 respondents said that they were "currently not involved with integrating OD and SD (12%).

This paper focuses on the first phase of the study; specifically the survey responses to the following questions:

1) What are the various activities, programs and services, staff developers are involved with in their respective districts?

2) To what extent do staff developers in the United States, who responded to the survey, perceive their knowledge, interest and use of organization development in education?

3) To what extent do staff development specialists in the United States, who responded to the survey, perceive their current knowledge, interest and use of integrating staff development and organization development?

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The results of the study are divided into four sections: characteristics of the staff developers who completed the questionnaire; and answers to questions one, two, and three as described above. Because the survey used Likert-style questions, the data from this study will be presented by: (1) using mean values between 1 and 5, with 1 being very low and 5 being very high; (2) using percentages where n = 115; and (3) using the Spearman correlation where 0 is a weak relationship and a strong relationship is +1 or –1.

Characteristics Of Responding Staff Developers

Over three-fourths of the responding staff developers reported their current involvement with staff development consulting, training, and facilitating to be high or very high. They repeatedly described themselves as "leaders," "cheerleaders," "risk takers," "dreamers," "life-long learners" and "omnivores." A majority of those responding had completed post-graduate work, with 8% having a specialist degree, 49% a master's degree, and 24% a doctorate. Out of the 115 respondents, 84 were female and 31 were male.

Most staff developers have been in their current position a very short time. The majority of staff developers (69%) had worked in their current position fewer than five years, with the mean for the group being 5.254 years. For 14% of the respondents, this was their first year in their current staff development position. In comparison, 12% of the respondents had worked in their current position of staff developer for more than 10 years. Their years of professional experience ranged from 8 to 42 years with a mean of 21.539 years of educational service. Their ages formed a bell-shaped curve, from 30 to 64, with the mean age being 44.928 years.

Although Staff Development Coordinator was the most frequent job title listed by respondents, there were 55 different job title descriptions written on the questionnaires. Twenty-one respondents listed Staff Development Coordinator as their current job title and 14 listed Staff Development Director. Training Specialist, the next most frequent title, was listed by 9 respondents. Administrator titles made up 10% of the job title descriptions with: 2 assistant principals; 3 principals; and 7 assistant superintendents. Classroom teacher was listed by 7 of those responding. The other 63 respondents listed an array of responses with no more than 2 or 3 respondents repeating any one job title description. These titles ranged from coordinators and directors of special services, facilitators, consultants, teacher trainers, and resource teachers. Split job title descriptions (e.g., Teacher/SD Coordinator, Curriculum/SD Coordinator) were reported by 15% of the respondents . It is worth noting that 71 respondents (62%) had the words staff development or staff developer somewhere in their job title description.

Most of the respondents to this survey worked in large school districts. More than half (55%) reported student populations over 10,000 and 41% listed more than 1000 teachers. No one mentioned fewer than 25 teachers in their district or fewer than 500 students. The remainder fell somewhere in between as shown in Chart I. Only 14 respondents said they worked outside the public schools, at either a private school, a teacher development center, an educational service district, or at the state level. Chart I shows the size of the school district based on the number of students and teachers.

Most of the respondents (92%) reported that their school districts were less than 50 miles away from a college or university, with 79% of the districts

less than 25 miles away. Only 2 respondents said that they were 100 miles or more from a college or university with an Education Department.

Chart I

The percentage of respondents reporting teacher and student size for their districts.

Teachers	Percentage	Students	Percentage
Over 1000	41%	Over 10,000	55%
500-1000	23%	6000-10,000	11%
300-500	11%	4000-6000	8%
150-300	13%	2000-4000	15%
25-150	10%	500-2000	10%
Less than 25	0%	Less than 500	0%
Don't Know	1%	Don't Know	0%
No Response	1%	No Response	1%

Activities, Programs, And Services

Few staff developers described their job responsibilities in the same way. Although there were some overlapping similarities with activities, it is clear that, like their current job titles, their job descriptions were being molded by the district in which they were working. For example, here are several written descriptions of activities, by staff developers who said their involvement with OD and/or their involvement with integrating SD and OD was average, high or very high:

> . . . I facilitate a four day program that works with groups of teachers making them aware of current trends and to have them reflect on their practice. It builds positive feelings about themselves and their work. Over 1/3 of our faculty has volunteered to be actively involved in our cooperative learning program. That program alone has changed school climate. Collaborative schools really do make a difference for kids and staff.
>
> . . . Using my training to move groups and district. Major responsibility in implementing a SD plan.
>
> . . . I currently work 1/2 time in personnel and 1/2 time in Staff Development. My primary responsibility is for Administrative

Training and to maintain a congruency with the SD training for teachers.

. . . We are in the first year of an entirely new administrative team. As staff development coordinator, I have provided training and offer assistance in curriculum planning, supervision, conferencing, dealing with individual or group problems, and acting as a general sounding board. We are currently working on new ways to involve faculty and staff in planning, marketing, curriculum changes and general management of the staff.

. . . Assisting in the development of site-based management.

. . . Surveying needs and interests of teachers, principals, curriculum staff members and others to design 4 days of inservice training for all staffs. Coordinate registrations, scheduling, and record management.

From the comments by staff developers, professional growth activities were planned on a district-wide bases, or at a building level. Some staff developers were in charge of the entire program (i.e., budget, decisions about activities, scheduling, training and credit), while others had a district staff development committee assisting them with decisions, training and responsibilities. Yet, other staff developers served only as a resource and communication link between buildings who made site-based decisions and managed their own staff development program and budget. Each staff development program appeared to be a unique blend, with staff developers "plugging the dam" and "bridging the gap" with their individual district's wants and needs.

The MAJOR activities reported by staff developers for the 1990-91 and 1991-92 school year are very diverse, with respondents from each district listing a unique combination of offerings. Some of the offerings seemed to center on state mandates. For example, Michigan had mandated a School Improvement Process which brought with it certain inservice requirements

and written reports that had to be turned in to the state at the end of the year for accountability (e.g., goals and objectives for each building). Other school districts were planning their activities about community social issues (e.g., gang related issues, alcohol and drugs, students at-risk, HIV/AIDS) or current district needs (computer inservice, Assertive Discipline).

Even though there is a seemingly inexhaustible list of different activities in which staff developers reported being involved, they all seemed to fit into several categories. They were, with few exceptions, designed for only Administrators and Teachers. Some respondents reported their school districts have recognized the potential of internal "experts" and are creating Trainers of Trainer programs or sending in-house people out to become "expert" with specific skills. The list of activities reported by staff developers included (but is by no means inconclusive): (1) **Instructional skills** (e.g., cooperative learning, Effective Elements of Instruction - Madeline Hunter, peer-coaching, Assertive Discipline, Mentor Teachers); (2) **Curriculum implementation and development** (e.g.,Whole Language, Iowa Writing Project, Math Their Way, Middle School Issues, Multi-cultural issues, Gifted and Talented,); (3) **Wellness** (e.g., Stress Management, Program Fitness); (4) **Effective school improvement** (e.g., strategic planning, site-based management, CBAM, IDEA); and (5) **individual organization development skills** (e.g., team-building, decision-making, leadership, trust building).

Most staff developers reported their districts were training only teachers or administrators. However, a few staff developers also mentioned that their district's inservices included support staff, parents and community members in their training or on their school improvement committees. This was especially true of staff developers in districts involved with site-based

management and/or strategic planning. A few staff developers stated their school districts were recognizing support staff as a valuable resource and were training them not only for job description responsibilities (e.g., how to be a better secretary, bus safety techniques) but also in how to deal with students (e.g., assisting with students-at-risk, substance abuse). Still others were beginning to reach out to the community and train parents in parenting skills.

OD Knowledge, Use And Interest

Staff developers were asked to rate their knowledge, use and interest in learning more about organization development. There were 53 Likert style questions, with 1 being very low and 5 being very high, and two areas for additional comments. The results from this portion of the survey follow.

Knowledge of Organization Development. Overall, the majority of staff developers responding to this survey ranked their knowledge of organization development, average, high or very high. Of all the OD skill areas, their perceived knowledge of communication, leadership, collaborative decision-making, and group trust building were ranked the highest by the majority of respondents. Staff developers felt they had the least knowledge about macrodesign elements, like preparing an OD contract or memorandum of agreement, and evaluating OD designs and activities. Other macrodesign elements (e.g., diagnosis; training of OD skills, exercises and procedures) were also rated lower. Chart II gives an overview of the elements of macrodesign and specific OD skills by their mean values.

Chart II

Mean Values for Knowledge, Use and Interest
(with 1 being **VERY LOW** and 5 being **VERY HIGH**)

Macrodesign Elements			
OD Skill	KNOWLEDGE	USE	INTEREST
Overall OD Skills	3.617	2.704	4.443
Diagnosis	3.148	2.739	4.287
OD Training	3.270	3.122	4.348
Survey-Data Procedures	3.461	3.287	4.157
Confrontation and Problem-solving	3.617	3.417	4.452
Process Observation and Feedback	3.670	3.626	4.252
Evaluating OD	2.861	2.843	4.304
Individual OD Skills			
OD Skill	KNOWLEDGE	USE	INTEREST
Organizational Conflict	3.330	3.235	4.470
Group Problem-solving	3.774	3.739	4.461
Collaborative Decision-making	3.922	3.904	4.470
Group Trust Building	3.887	3.809	4.452
Group Maintenance and Team Building	3.826	3.730	4.426
Leadership skills	4.139	3.983	4.391

Interest In Learning More about OD. Interest in learning more about organization development is high among staff developers responding to this survey. More than 75% expressed a very high interest in knowing more about all OD skill areas, except preparing an OD contract. Most of the respondents in this survey were internal staff developers for a school district. This may account for their lack of interest in learning more about memorandums of agreement and contract writing.

Staff developers have repeatedly classified themselves as "life-long learners" and "omnivores." This personality trait may help to explain why, no matter how high staff developers reported their knowledge level for any of the specific OD skills, they still wanted more information! The percentage of respondents wanting more information was, in several areas, very close to their already perceived high knowledge level, and often much greater, even when they were already highly involved with using the skill in their district. Chart III shows the percentage of staff developers who rated their knowledge, use and interest as high or very high.

Use Of OD Skills. Over half of those who responded to this survey, stated that they are using OD skills in their staff development work at an average or higher level. Chart III shows the percent of respondents who perceived their use of OD skills to be high or very high. It appears, however, that most staff developers were using individual OD skills rather than elements of a macrodesign. For example, communication and leadership skills were the two skills that staff developers used most often. In fact, over three-fourths of the responding staff developers rated their use of communication and leaderships skills at a high or very high level. Group trust building, collaborative decision-making, and group problem-solving were also used by over half of the respondents at a high or very high level. The skills used least frequently by staff developers were once again primarily OD macrodesign elements (e.g., diagnosis, OD training, evaluation, survey-data procedures, and OD meeting procedures).

Chart III

Respondents who perceived their knowledge, use and interest of OD skills to be HIGH or VERY HIGH.

OD Skill	Knowledge of OD Skill	Use Of OD Skill	Interest in Learning More
Readiness	51%	NA	86%
Preparing an OD Contract	20%	NA	68%
Diagnosis	44%	24%	84%
OD Training	46%	37%	85%
Survey-Data Procedures	54%	44%	80%
Confrontation and Problem-solving	60%	51%	92%
Process Observation and Feedback	60%	59%	80%
Communication	83%	78%	85%
OD Meeting Procedures	45%	44%	79%
Organizational Conflict	47%	45%	86%
Group Problem-solving	69%	63%	86%
Collaborative Decision-making	75%	66%	88%
Group Trust Building	77%	70%	88%
Group Maintenance and Team Building	72%	61%	87%
Leadership skills	85%	76%	85%
Evaluating OD	30%	33%	85%
Overall OD Skills	56%	31%	90%

The staff developers who reported their knowledge of an OD skill level to be average or higher were more likely to be using that skill in their staff development work. Similarly, they were less likely to be using the OD skill if their knowledge level was average or below. For example, 47% stated their knowledge of OD procedure skills was high or very high and the same 44%

stated their use was equally high, with only 3% of those respondents moving to average or below. The same held true at the low end of the scale, with those who perceived their knowledge to be below average, reporting the use of meeting skills to be below average. This pattern, which remained fairly consistent for all skill areas, was evident when looking at cross-tabulations of Knowledge and Skill Use, with SPSS (a computer statistical data analysis program).

When analyzing the Knowledge and Skill data using SPSS, some areas had a higher Spearman correlation than others. The highest Spearman correlation was .77775 for OD Training and the two lowest were .56911 for Group Trust Building and .54568 for Diagnosis. This makes sense because unless staff developers have really internalized a skill, they cannot teach someone else that skill effectively. Thus, most staff developers probably will not attempt to teach others OD skills, unless they fully comprehend those skills. At the same time, most teachers have learned how to diagnose students and how to build trust among students in their classrooms, or they think they have. Since most staff developers began as classroom teachers, it is not surprising that they might perceive they are using these skills (trust building and diagnosis), even though they do not think they have a high knowledge of them as OD skills, or vice versa. The mean Spearman correlation for all skill areas is .66091. The breakdown is shown in Chart IV.

More of the staff developers perceived themselves to have the ability to act as an OD facilitator (mean of 3.209), than as an OD consultant (mean of 2.870) or an OD trainer (mean of 2.817). Forty-one percent of the respondents felt that they had a low or very low ability to conduct OD training. Thirty-seven percent felt they had below average skills for OD consulting and 28% perceived their OD facilitating skills to be low or very low. In contrast, forty-

eight percent of the respondents rated their ability as a facilitator to be high or very high; 32% rated their ability to act as an OD trainer as high or very high; and 35% rated their ability as a consultant to be high or very high.

CHART IV

Cross-tabulation results of Knowledge and Use of Skills, Reported by Spearman Correlations.

OD Macrodesign Elements		Individual OD Skills	
Overall OD Skills	.55775	Meeting Procedures	.74581
Diagnosis	.54568	Communication	.62046
OD Training	.77775	Organizational Conflict	.61734
Survey-Data Processes	.67122	Group Problem Solving	.69757
Confrontation/Problem-solving	.63850	Collaborative Decision-making	.69680
Process Observation/Feedback	.66921	Group Trust Building	.56911
		Leadership Skills	.72619
		Team-building	.63935
		Evaluating OD	.74096

Although there were three staff developers who reported low or very low knowledge of organization development, they still felt able to facilitate, consult or train others in OD activities at an average or above level. However, more staff developers perceived their OD knowledge to be average, high or very high and perceived their ability to act as a consultant, trainer or facilitator to be low or very low. In fact, 40 staff developers perceived a high knowledge of OD and a low ability to conduct OD training; 34 staff developers perceived high knowledge of OD and a low ability to do OD consulting; and 27 staff developers perceived a high knowledge level and perceived their ability to be low as an OD facilitator. It is evident, that most of the responding staff developers are more comfortable facilitating an OD project than consulting or conducting OD training.

Most responding staff developers estimated the percentage of the general budget spent on staff development to be low. This is after 48% stated

that the approximate total general budget was over $25 million for their school district for the 1990-91 school year. Only 1 respondent reported a total, general budget less than $1 million, and the remainder reported budgets somewhere in between. Chart V shows staff developer's perceptions of their budget, the percent of the budget spent on staff development and/or organization development activities and the amount of time during a year that a typical teacher spends with staff development and/or organization development activities.

Chart V

Respondents perceptions of budget and teacher involvement for their school districts.

Total General School District Budget		Percent of Budget Designated for SD and/or OD Activities		Typical Teacher Time Per Year Spent in SD and/or OD Activities	
$25 million +	48%	15% +	3%	10+ Days	2%
$10-25 million	17%	10-15%	2%	9-10 Days	4%
$5-10 million	9%	5-10%	4%	6-8 Days	12%
$3-5 million	5%	3-5%	11%	4-5 Days	32%
$1-3 million	5%	1-3%	34%	2-3 Days	40%
< $1 million	1%	< 1%	28%	1 Day	4%
Don't know	10%	Don't Know	12%	1/2 Day	3%
No response	5%	No Response	6%	0 Days	3%

Staff developers rated their districts priority for organization development to be average, with a mean of 2.930. They perceived their districts priority for funding staff development to be slightly higher, with a mean of 3.325 Most respondents, however, estimated the percentage of the general budget spent on staff development and organization development to be low. When asked to estimate the percentage of the total budget spent on staff development and/or organization development activities in their district, 17% either did not respond or did not know the percentage. Six respondents reported their staff development budget to be higher than 11% of their

district's total general budget. Of these six respondents, four were not employed by a single school district; one worked for a State Department coordinating staff development, two with a Regional Service/Training Center, and one in a School Department. All four of these respondents were referring to their own staff development budget, used to train their own building staff. Only two staff developers reported that their districts allotted a high percentage of their total general budget for professional growth activities. One staff developer, from a school district in Connecticut reported spending more than 15% of their total budget (between $10-25 million, with 1000+ teachers) for staff development activities which involved the typical teacher 6-8 days during the school year. The other staff developer, who reported a school district which spent over 15% of their total general budget on staff development and/or organization development, was from Florida. This was a larger district with over 10,000 students, 1,000 teachers and a general budget over $25 million. The typical teacher in this district was involved 4-5 days in staff development/organization development activities, during the 1990-91 school year. Most respondents for this survey (70%) stated that the typical teacher was involved in staff development and/or organization development activities between 2-5 days (See Chart V).

Overall, staff developers responding to the survey, perceived that their districts placed a higher priority on staff development activities than they did on organization development activities. Seventy-four percent of the respondents said their districts placed an average to very high priority on funding staff development activities that are intended only for teachers and administrators in their districts, while 20% rated their district's funding priority as low or very low. Fifty-seven percent of the responding staff developers rated their district's funding priority for organization development

activities as average to very high, an overall difference between SD and OD of 17%. In fact, 37% of the staff developers said their district placed a low or very low priority on funding organization development activities intended only for teachers and administrators within their districts.

Half of the responding staff developers reported receiving some grant money for their staff development programs, but many of their responses were ambiguous about the type of funding or how much they received. Most who reported grants mentioned: state funds (e.g., Oregon's House Bill 2020 Grants, Phase III Funds, Mentor Teacher Funds, Students-At-Risk); Federal Money (e.g., Chapter II, Chapter VII - Workshops/Programs for E.S.L); or specific curricular funds (e.g., Title II - Math and Science, Substance Abuse, Talented and Gifted). Only 5 staff developers mentioned foundation grants, (e.g., Ford Foundation, Eisenhower Grants). Most of the time respondents did not specify how they used the grants. However, when they did, they made comments like:

> . . . Used to provide release time to allow teachers to plan curriculum, redesign ungraded primary, Coalition of Essential Schools, and support groups for teachers.
>
> . . . Chapter II moneys used to fund coursework designed to meet district school goals.
>
> . . . mostly workshops (how to, make it - take it)
>
> . . . Math/Science grant for inservice programs for teachers, calculators to use in upper levels and creative science materials and services available locally.
>
> . . . HB2020 grants ($1000 per teacher) in the building. Focus on building plan. OTE Grants from NWREL. State funds to develop staff awareness of organization related problems.

Fifty-seven percent of the respondents reported average or above availability of organization development resources (a 2.737 mean). In contrast, over three-fourths of the respondents reported the availability of

staff development resources in their district to be average or above, with 23% reporting very high availability (mean of 3.40). This is a difference of 21% between staff development and organization development. Only 6% of those responding reported OD resources to be highly available, with an overall mean of 2.737. The use of OD resources in the district was also low, with a mean of 2.591. Their perceived availability of staff development resources remained higher (mean of 3.40), and their use of staff development resources is even higher (mean of 3.704). See Chart VI for comparison of staff development and organization development availability and use of resources.

Chart VI

The percentage of respondents reporting on the availability and use of staff development and organization development resources in their school districts.

	Availability of SD Resources in District	Use of SD Resources in District	Availability of OD Resources in District	Use of OD Resources in District
Very High	23%	35%	6%	5%
High	31%	29%	24%	20%
Average	24%	22%	27%	29%
Low	13%	7%	26%	28%
Very Low	4%	1%	11%	11%
Don't Know	0%	0%	1%	0%
No Response	5%	6%	5%	7%

Even though staff developers perceived themselves using OD skills often, the amount of their budgets and length of time spent on inservice activities indicates otherwise. With a few exceptions, when looking at the priority for funding, the amount of funding and time spent on organization development, there were insufficient resources available to support, a systematically planned OD macrodesign, with sustained effort, over time to create changes in the organizational structures, norms or processes. Although staff developers were beginning to incorporate OD skills into their inservice

training, the overall sequence of a comprehensive OD project (macrodesign), as stated earlier, seemed to be absent.

Integrating Staff Development And Organization Development

On the questionnaire, staff developers were asked to rate their knowledge, use and interest in learning more about integrating staff development and organization development. There were 3 Likert style questions, with 1 being very low and 5 being very high, and two areas for additional comments.

Knowledge about Integrating SD and OD. The majority of staff developers perceived their knowledge of how to integrate staff development and organization development to be average or above, with a mean of 3.157. The more staff developers knew about integrating staff development and organization development, the more likely they were to be involved with integrating the two in their districts (Spearman correlation .61011).

Interest in Learning More about Integrating SD and OD. Not surprisingly, 83% of responding staff developers had a high or very high interest in learning more about the integration of staff development and organization development (a mean of 4.383).

Staff Developer's Use of SD and OD. Forty-two percent of all responding staff developers reported a low or very low use of integrating staff development and organization development, (mean of 2.930). Staff Developers were more likely to be involved with organization development if they were involved with staff development at an average or above level (Spearman correlation of .42682). They were even more likely to be integrating staff development and organization development if their OD use was average or above (Spearman correlation of .61099). In contrast, the level

staff developers were involved with staff development activities, did not appear to make a difference in how involved the staff developers were with the integration staff development and organization development (Spearman correlation of .24796).

Staff developers were more likely to be involved in integrating staff development, when they perceived themselves to have the ability to consult (Spearman correlation of .47662), to train (Spearman correlation of .52600) or to facilitate (Spearman correlation of .59750). Twenty-one percent of the responding staff developers who felt they were highly qualified to work as an OD consultant said they were highly involved with integrating staff development and OD. Similarly, 23% reported a high ability to conduct OD training and were highly involved with integrating SD and OD. Twenty-eight percent reported being highly qualified to serve as an OD facilitator and also perceived a high involvement in integrating SD and OD.

The budget, percentage of the budget or teacher time allotted for staff development and organization development did not appear to be related to the level of involvement staff developers have with integrating SD and OD in their districts. (Spearman correlation's are: budget, –.08124; percent of the budget, –.06256; and amount of teacher involvement time, .14593). Likewise, the size of the district according to teacher and student size made no difference as to the perceived amount staff developers were involved with integrating SD and OD.

The management style of the district did make a difference in the level staff developers were involved with staff development, organization development, and the integration of SD and OD. On the survey, staff developers reported a variety of management styles. Fifty-nine percent stated that their district used only one management style: 24% reported top-down

(one-on-one); 27% reported collaborative; 7% reported site-based; 1% reported laissez-faire; and one person did not respond. The other 40% of the respondents circled a variety of management styles with the four most popular combinations being: top-down/site-based (7%); top-down/collaborative (8%); collaborative/site-based (9%); and top-down/collaborative/site-based (12%). Many respondents took the time to write or draw in arrows to indicate that their districts were moving away from the top-down management style, toward either site-based or a collaborative style management structure.

Seventy percent of staff developers, who listed their school districts used only a top-down management style, also reported average or higher involvement with staff development consulting, training and facilitating. This was considerably lower than other management styles, which had 88% or above reporting average or high involvement with staff development. Similarly, 37% who worked in a top-down district were involved with OD consulting, training and facilitating activities. Staff Developers from districts only involved with site-based management were the most likely to report average or above use of OD skills (71%). All other combinations fell somewhere in-between.

A similar relationship was true for staff developers' involvement with the integration of SD and OD, and top-down management. Forty-eight percent of respondents in districts with top-down management perceived their involvement in the integration of SD and OD to be average or above. Similarly, collaborative management and site-based management both had only a slightly higher percentage of staff developers reporting average or above use of integrating SD and OD. However, the combinations of management styles, where districts were moving away from top-down to either collaborative or site-based, seemed to have a greater percentage of staff

developers who were involved with integrating SD and OD. Seventy-seven percent of responding staff developers, in a district with top-down management moving toward site-based management, reported an average or above average use of integrating SD and OD. Chart VII reports some interesting relationships between the perceived management style and the level of staff developers' involvement. However, because some of the management styles had so few respondents, the conclusions from this data may not prove to be accurate. Because the idea is intriguing, it warrants further investigation, and as such, has been included in this report.

Chart VII

SD, OD, and integrated SD/OD Involvement as reported by District's Management Style where # = number of respondents reporting each management style.

Management Style	Reported Management Styles		Staff Development Involvement		Organization Development Involvement		SD AND OD Involvement	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Collaborative	31	27%	29	93%	14	45%	16	52%
Collaborative/ Don't know	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Collaborative/ Site-based	11	10%	10	91%	7	63%	7	63%
Laissez-faire	2	1%	2	100%	0	0%	1	50%
Site-based	7	6%	7	100%	5	71%	4	57%
Top-down	27	23%	19	70%	10	37%	13	48%
Top-down/ Collaborative	9	8%	8	88%	6	66%	6	66%
Top-down/ Collaborative/ Laissez-faire	1	1%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%
Top-down/ Collaborative/ Site-based	14	12%	14	100%	7	50%	9	64%
Top-down/ Collaborative/ Site-based/ Laissez-faire	2	2%	2	100%	1	50%	1	50%
Top-down/ Site-based	9	8%	9	100%	6	66%	7	77%
No Response	1	1%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%

CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY

The conclusions presented here are based upon the perceptions of responding staff developers. Interest is an attitude. Therefore, a conclusion can be drawn about the relationship between the responding staff developers and their attitude in learning more about OD and integrating OD with SD. The knowledge and use of OD skills can be measured by observable behaviors. Because knowledge and use are observable behaviors, staff developers' perceptions of their knowledge and use may or may not be accurate.

The original sample was adequate. Even though the rate of returned surveys was low (22%), respondents were from a representative sample of the United States. A follow-up of non-respondents was not conducted. From comments made on some of the questionnaires and during telephone interviews, it is possible that staff developers were simply "too busy" to respond.

The limitations of this study should be considered when reading the following conclusions. But the existing data are strong and warrant further investigation. Keeping this in mind, the conclusions from this study can be summarized as follows:

(1) Most of the responding staff developers are in relatively new positions and have diverse titles. Thus, staff developers are a new breed, without a clearly established role identity or job description.

(2) Although staff developers think they know a lot about OD, their perceived knowledge about the elements of macrodesign (e.g., diagnosis, evaluation, survey-data-procedures, training, evaluation) are much less than for specific OD skills (e.g., communication, trust building, leadership, team-

building). Staff developers have a better idea of the human relations skills of OD (group maintenance) than they do about the execution of a classical OD macrodesign or a sustained OD project.

(3) Most responding staff developers have a positive attitude and want more information about OD techniques and strategies. Even when they perceived their knowledge and use to be at very high levels, they still were greatly interested in learning more.

(4) The higher staff developers rated their knowledge level, the more likely they were to be involved with using a specific OD strategy or technique in their staff development practices. Similarly, the higher their perceived ability to act as a facilitator, consultant or trainer, the more involved they were with integrating SD and OD. Therefore, the more knowledgeable and involved staff developers are with OD, the more likely staff developers will be to integrate SD and OD.

(5) Staff Developers felt more comfortable and perceived their ability to be higher facilitating OD projects than they did consulting and training. Consulting and training require comprehension and internalization of OD knowledge and skills. OD consultants give "expert" advise, and trainers instruct others to reach a level of proficiency in their use of OD skills. In contrast, facilitators assist with group process to make the task easier or less difficult.

(6) Respondents perceived their school districts to place a higher priority of funding on staff development activities than on funding organization development activities. But, the percentage of the total general budget for both staff development and organization development is low.

(7) Although staff developers think they use OD skills often, their budgets belied implementation of whole OD macrodesigns and projects which

used a "systematically planned, sustained effort at system self-study and improvement, focusing explicitly on change in formal and informal procedures, processes, norms, or structures" (Schmuck and Runkel, 1988, p. 4).

(8) It appears that responding staff developers are becoming more involved with organization development techniques and strategies as school districts change from a top-down management style to a more participatory management style (collegial, site-based, or any combination). Because of the limitations of a small sample, this conclusion warrants further investigation.

(9) Responding staff developers, in school districts which have traditionally involved only teachers and administrators in professional growth opportunities, are beginning to involve support staff (e.g., secretaries, bus drivers, custodians) as well as reaching out to parents and other community members. Often these parents and community members are becoming involved with the restructuring process as members of various decision-making committees.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Fullan, Michael, Mathew B. Miles, and Gib Taylor. (Spring, 1980). "Organization Development in Schools: The State of the Art." REVIEW OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, Vol. 50 (1), p. 121-183.

Schmuck, Richard A. and Philip J. Runkel. (1985). THE HANDBOOK OF ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT. Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc.